

**RE: Hg Fish**

Wax, Peter N. <pwax@nd.gov>

Thu 7/2/2020 10:42 AM

To: Wirick, Holiday <wirick.holiday@epa.gov>

Lowering the Hg criteria a reasonable amount would not be an issue for ND. Will watch for it.

---

**From:** Wirick, Holiday

**Sent:** Thursday, July 2, 2020 11:25 AM

**To:** Wax, Peter N. <pwax@nd.gov>

**Subject:** Re: Hg Fish

**CAUTION:** This email originated from an outside source. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know they are safe.

I was referring to the aquatic life methyl mercury criteria from 1995 which is 1.4 ug/L acute and 0.77 ug/L chronic for freshwater.

For human health, the 2001 methyl mercury criterion for the consumption of organism only is 0.3 mg/kg. The fish tissue residue criterion for methylmercury is based on a total fish consumption rate of 0.0175 kg/day.

---

**From:** Wax, Peter N. <pwax@nd.gov>

**Sent:** Thursday, July 2, 2020 10:20 AM

**To:** Wirick, Holiday <wirick.holiday@epa.gov>

**Subject:** RE: Hg Fish

For aquatic life? Or translating methylmercury to human health from fish ?

---

**From:** Wirick, Holiday

**Sent:** Thursday, July 2, 2020 11:12 AM

**To:** Wax, Peter N. <pwax@nd.gov>

**Subject:** Re: Hg Fish

**CAUTION:** This email originated from an outside source. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know they are safe.

OK. There are some issues with it though which is what I was going to mention. Litigation in Idaho might result in a methyl mercury number to replace the current 1995 criteria, but who knows when that may be?

Have a great 4th!

Holly

---

**From:** Wax, Peter N. <pwax@nd.gov>

**Sent:** Thursday, July 2, 2020 9:53 AM

**To:** Wirick, Holiday <[wirick.holiday@epa.gov](mailto:wirick.holiday@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: Hg Fish

I got it.

---

**From:** Wirick, Holiday

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 1, 2020 1:57 PM

**To:** Wax, Peter N. <[pwax@nd.gov](mailto:pwax@nd.gov)>

**Subject:** Re: Hg Fish

**CAUTION:** This email originated from an outside source. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know they are safe.

Hi Pete, just a quick note to ask if I can respond to you tomorrow? I'm working on a fire drill right now - but great news on the ammonia.

Thanks,  
Holly

---

**From:** Wax, Peter N. <[pwax@nd.gov](mailto:pwax@nd.gov)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 1, 2020 6:44 AM

**To:** Wirick, Holiday <[wirick.holiday@epa.gov](mailto:wirick.holiday@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** Hg Fish

Holly:

What is the EPA recommended Methyl Mercury concentration.

Ammonia has survived the Section Chiefs review. Will be for all waters and removing all site specifics.

Need to explain why we are still protective moving Hg to 304 recommended number.

Pete

Peter N. Wax  
Special Projects  
Division of Water Quality

701.328.5268 • [pwax@nd.gov](mailto:pwax@nd.gov) • <https://deq.nd.gov/>

